REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12-22, 30-50, 53-59, 61-72, 75-78, 80-83, 85-88 and 95-97 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In an Office Action dated September 12, 2007, claims 1-10, 12-22, 30-50, 53-59, 61-72, 75-78, 80-83, 85-88 and 95-97 were rejected. Applicants thank Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

Applicants are amending claims 1, 30, 53 and 85 in this Amendment and Response. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under § 35 USC 103(a) in View of Rukman and White

Examiner rejects claims 1-10, 13-15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 30-45, 48-50, 53-59, 61-63, 65, 68-72, 75-78, 80-83, 85-89 and 95-97 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0185883 to Rukman ("Rukman"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0114174 to Walsh et al. ("Walsh") and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0025309 to Macleod Beck et al. ("Beck"). This rejection is now traversed in light of the amended claims.

As amended, claim 1 recites:

> A method for displaying a plurality of related SMS (Short Message Service) messages comprising:

reviewing a plurality of SMS messages associated with a first party;

determining whether to thread one or more SMS messages from the plurality of SMS messages into an SMS message thread by applying a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS message and applying a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages, the outgoing SMS message rules different from the incoming SMS message rules and the one or more SMS messages also associated with a second party; and

outputting the SMS message thread. (emphasis added)

The claimed invention is a method for displaying related Short Message Service (SMS) messages as a message thread. Initially, a plurality of SMS messages associated with a first party are reviewed. A determination is then made whether to thread one or more SMS messages, also associated with a second party, from the plurality of SMS messages. To determine whether to thread one or more SMS messages, a set of incoming SMS message rules are applied to incoming SMS messages and a set of outgoing SMS message rules, which are different from the incoming SMS message rules, are applied to outgoing SMS messages. The resulting SMS message thread is then output, allowing a user to view related SMS messages as a message thread.

By applying a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS messages and a different set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages, the claimed invention increases customization of thread generation or modification. The incoming SMS message rules determine the relationship between received SMS messages and prior SMS messages using different criteria than the outgoing SMS message rules, such as threading messages from known users or not threading messages from specified addresses. This allows the incoming SMS message rules to prevent unnecessary or unsolicited message threads to simplify review and evaluation of incoming SMS messages. The outgoing SMS message rules determine the

relationship between transmitted SMS messages and prior SMS messages using various criteria, such as message arrival time, message destination or other suitable criteria. Hence, the claimed invention allows independent thread generation and modification of incoming and outgoing message threads by applying different threading rules to incoming and outgoing messages.

Rukman discloses identifying and organizing related messages using message text, such as a subject line. However, Rukman fails to disclose "applying a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS message and applying a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages, the outgoing SMS message rules different from the incoming SMS message rules." Rather, Rukman describes using a single parameter, such as subject text or message time to organize both incoming and outgoing messages. *See* Rukman, ¶ [0028], [0033]-[0034], [0047]. Accordingly, the technique disclosed in Rukman does not apply a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS messages and a different set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages, but merely uses a single specified parameter to organize both incoming and outgoing messages. For example, Rukman uses the contents of the message subject line (e.g., the number of times "RE:" appears in the subject line or a number in the subject line) to organize messages, regardless of whether the message is incoming or outgoing. *See* Rukman, ¶ [0047]. Hence, Rukman does not allow for application of separate message rules to incoming messages and outgoing messages.

Walsh also does not disclose "applying a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS message and applying a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages, the outgoing SMS message rules different from the incoming SMS message rules," as recited in amended claim 1. Walsh discloses incorporating a message thread identifier into a message and using the thread identifier to determine a thread associated with the message. *See* Walsh,

Abstract; ¶¶ [0005]-[0006]. Hence, Walsh uses the embedded thread identifier to organize messages and facilitate replying to previously received messages. Rather than apply a set of incoming SMS message rules and a different set of outgoing SMS message rules to incoming and outgoing SMS messages, respectively, Walsh examines the embedded thread identifier in each message to organize messages. As Walsh merely discloses embedding a thread identifier in each message, there is no disclosure of "applying a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS messages and applying a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages, the outgoing SMS message rules different from the incoming SMS message rules," as recited in amended claim 1.

Similarly, Beck fails to remedy the deficient disclosures of Rukman and Walsh. Specifically, Beck also fails to disclose "applying a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS message and applying a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages, the outgoing SMS message rules different from the incoming SMS message rules," as claimed. Beck discloses a multimedia communication center (MMCC) for accepting communication from clients and displaying an interactive self-help wizard in a graphic interface. *See* Beck, ¶¶ [0025]-[0027]. The system disclosed in Walsh stores text-based and multimedia-based interactions in a repository for subsequent retrieval and analysis. *See* Beck, ¶¶ [0140]-[0142]. Beck merely classifies interactions according to transmission type, such as video phone interactions, e-mails, COST interactions, WEB interactions or video mails, and then classifies interactions of a particular type according to a business rule. *See* Beck, ¶ [162]; [0164]-[0165]. Hence, there is no disclosure in Beck of applying different threading rules to input SMS messages and output SMS messages, but of applying business rules to all interactions, both incoming and outgoing, of a particular transmission type.

Further, to apply these business rules, Beck merely assigns an identifier to an entity and organizes or stores interactions based on that identifier. *See* Beck, ¶ [0159]. Hence, Beck merely groups both incoming and outgoing interactions according to the presence or absence of an identifier in the interaction. While the claimed invention applies a set of incoming message rules and a different set of outgoing message rules, Beck merely examines an interaction for an identifier and organizes all interactions, regardless of whether the interactions are transmissions or receipts, according to the identifier. *See* Beck, ¶¶ [0159]-[0165]. Hence, Beck facilitates subsequent retrieval of prior interactions using an identifier associated with the interactions. Rather than apply a set of incoming SMS message rules and a different set of outgoing SMS message rules to incoming and outgoing SMS messages, respectively, Beck merely examines all interactions for a specific identifier to determine interaction grouping.

As to the dependent claims, because claims 2-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21, 22 and 68-72 are dependent on claim 1, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 2-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21, 22 and 68-72. Hence, claims 2-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21, 22 and 68-72 are patentable over the cited reference.

Independent claim 30 has been similarly amended to recite "a threading rule database including a set of incoming SMS message rules applicable to incoming SMS messages and a set of outgoing SMS message rules applicable to outgoing SMS messages, wherein the set of outgoing SMS message rules are different from the set of incoming SMS message rules." Independent claims 53 and 85 have been similarly amended to recite "applying a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS message and applying a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages, the outgoing SMS message rules different from the incoming SMS message rules." Therefore, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are also

applicable to claims 30, 53 and 85. Hence, claims 30, 53 and 85 are patentable over the cited reference.

Claims 31-45, 48-50 and 75-78 depend from claim 30, so all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 31-45, 48-50 and 75-78. Hence claims 31-45, 48-50 and 75-78 are patentable over the cited reference.

Claims 54-59, 61-63, 65 and 80-83 depend from claim 53, so all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated to as to apply to claims 54-59, 61-63, 65 and 80-83. Hence, claims 54-59, 61-63, 65 and 80-83 are patentable over the cited reference.

Claims 86-88 depend from claim 85, so all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 86-88. Hence, claims 86-88 are patentable over the cited reference.

As for claims 11, 24, 60, 73, 79, 84 and 89, Applicants have canceled these claims, thereby obviating the basis for this rejection.

Hence claims 1-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21, 22, 30-45, 48-50, 53-59, 61-63, 65, 68-72, 75-68, 80-83 and 85-88 are patentable over the cited reference.

Response to Rejection Under § 35 USC 103(a) in View of Rukman, Walsh and Kraft

Examiner rejects claims 16, 19, 46-47, 64 and 66-67 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Rukman, Walsh and Beck in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0006889 to Kraft ("Kraft"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As claims 16 and 19 depend from claim 1, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 16 and 19. As claims 46 and 47 depend

from claim 30, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 30 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 46 and 47. As claims 64, 66 and 67 depend from claim 53, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 52 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 64, 66 and 67.

Kraft is cited to make up for the combination of Rukman and Walsh's failure to disclose "a rule to prevent expired SMS messages from being threaded," "displaying an icon in the SMS application to represent a threaded SMS" and "outputting the SMS message thread to an SMS application for display in a threaded format." However, Kraft discloses a method for handling a message exchange session where the message history, or a portion of the message history, is transmitted between terminals during the message exchange session. *See* Kraft, ¶ ¶ [0004]-[0005]. While the message exchange disclosed in Kraft maintains a history of exchanged messages, it does not apply "a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS messages" or apply "a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages, the outgoing SNS message rules different from the incoming SMS message rules." Hence, Kraft does not remedy the deficiencies of Rukman, Walsh and Beck.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, claims 16, 19, 46, 47, 64, 66 and 67 are patentable over the cited references, both alone and in combination.

Response to Rejection Under § 35 USC 103(a) in View of Rukman, Walsh and Kanefsky

Examiner rejects claim 20 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Rukman, Walsh and Beck in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,799,033 to Kanefsky ("Kanefsky"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As claim 20 depends from claim 1, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claim 20.

Kanefsky is cited to make up for the combination of Rukman and Walsh's failure to disclose "the SMS application is a network browser." However, Kanefsky discloses a mobile telephone text messaging device which displays static text from past messages and a message composition field for inputting text. *See* Kanefsky, col. 1, lines 47-65. The mobile telephone text messaging device disclosed in Kanefsky merely displays text from previous messages while a new message is composed and does not apply "a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS messages" or apply "a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages, the outgoing SMS message rules different from the incoming SMS message rules." Hence, Kraft does not remedy the deficiencies of Rukman, Walsh and Beck.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, claim 20 is patentable over the cited references, both alone and in combination.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-10, 12-22, 30-50, 53-59, 61-72, 75-78, 80-83, 85-88 and 95-97, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
RICHARD J. DONALD, DAVID L. WILLIAMS
AND DAVID MATISKELLA

Date: December 12, 2007 By: /Brian G. Brannon/

Brian G. Brannon, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 57,219
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7610
Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: bbrannon@fenwick.com